



# INFORMER



British Computer Society  
Information Retrieval Specialist Group

Volume.10

Spring 2000

ISSN 0950-4974

## Byeeee!!!!

This is the last issue from the current editors. After three and a half years in the hot seat, we have decided it's time for a change and will be handing the responsibility of producing the Informer over to a new editorial team.

If you are interested in helping to develop the Informer, either by taking over as the new editor or joining the editorial gang, please email Jan-Jap (email on page 2).

We've had a lot of laughs watching the world of IR, and would like to thank everyone who made our task of putting together this newsletter much easier. You know who you are...

....so it's goodbye from him and goodbye from me

**Ian and Jon**

---

## Contents

|                             |   |                 |   |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------|---|
| Who's who .....             | 2 | CIR 2000 .....  | 2 |
| Computers and society ..... | 3 | IRSG 2000 ..... | 8 |
| Conference calls ..         | 6 |                 |   |

---

# Who's who

## IRSG Committee Contact List 1999 - 2000



**BCS**

*Wondering who you should contact about what? Well, here's the current list of contacts.*

### *Chair*

#### **Jan J IJdens**

Sharp Laboratories of Europe  
Oxford Science Park  
Oxford OX4 4GA  
Email: jan@sharp.co.uk (or chair.irsg@bcs.org.uk)

### *Vice-Chair*

#### **Mounia Lalmas**

Department of Computing Science  
Queen Mary and Westfield College  
University of London  
Email: mounia@dcs.qmw.ac.uk

### *Secretary*

#### **Jane Reid**

Department of Computing Science  
Queen Mary and Westfield College  
University of London  
Email: jane@dcs.qmw.ac.uk

### *Treasurer*

#### **Margaret Graham**

Institute for Image Data Research  
University of Northumbria  
at Newcastle  
Email: margaret.graham@unn.ac.uk

### *Colloquium 2000*

#### **Stephen Robertson**

Microsoft Research Ltd  
St George House, 1 Guildhall Street,  
Cambridge CB2 3NH, U.K.  
Email: ser@microsoft.com

### *One-day events*

#### **Mounia Lalmas**

as above

### *Ordinary members*

#### **John Davies**

Information Access Research.  
BT Laboratories  
Email: john.davies@bt-sys.bt.co.uk

#### **Ayse S Goker-Arslan**

School of Computer and Mathematical  
Sciences  
The Robert Gordon University  
Email: asga@scms.rgu.ac.uk

#### **David Harper**

School of Computer and Mathematical  
Sciences  
The Robert Gordon University  
Email: d.harper@scms.rgu.ac.uk

#### **Monica Landoni**

Department of Information Science  
University of Strathclyde  
Email: monica@dis.strath.ac.uk

#### **John Lindsay**

School of Information Systems  
Kingston University  
Email: lindsay@kingston.ac.uk

#### **Andrew MacFarlane**

Department. Of Information Science  
City University  
Email: andym@soi.city.ac.uk

#### **Kerry Rodden**

Computer Laboratory  
University of Cambridge  
Email: Kerry.Rodden@cl.cam.ac.uk

#### **Tony Rose**

Canon Research Centre Europe Ltd  
Guildford  
Email: tgr@cre.canon.co.uk

#### **Steve Wade**

School of Computing and Mathematics  
University of Huddersfield  
Email: s.j.wade@hud.ac.uk

### *Informer Team*

#### **Jon Ritchie**

Department of Computing Science  
University of Glasgow  
Email: jon@dcs.gla.ac.uk

#### **Ian Ruthven**

Department of Computing Science  
University of Glasgow  
Email: igr@dcs.gla.ac.uk

### **CIR2000 - Third UK Conference on Image Retrieval**

4 - 5 May 2000

Old Ship Hotel, Brighton, United  
Kingdom

<http://www.unn.ac.uk/iidr/>

Thursday 4 May 2000

### **Morning Session:**

Keynote Address: Dr Richard Nicol  
(British Telecom, Adastral Park)

Trade Exhibition. Demonstrations and  
Poster viewing

### **Afternoon Session:**

*Theme:* Video Asset Management

*Plenary session:* Dr Ruud Bolle (IBM  
Thomas Watson Research Center)

*Parallel sessions:* - **Research**

**Workshop:** submitted papers.

**Practitioner Workshop:** presentations  
including Amanda Huntley (Huntley  
Archives) and Frank Gray (South East  
Film and Video Archive)

Product Reviews

### **Friday 5 May 2000**

### **Morning Session:**

*Theme:* Image metadata

*Plenary session:* Professor Howard  
Besser (University of California at Los  
Angeles)

*Parallel sessions:* - **Research**

**Workshop:** submitted papers.

**Practitioner Workshop:** presentations  
including Chris Hayes (Getty Images),  
Catherine Moriarty (Design Council  
Archive), Stephen Tope and Peter  
Enser (University of Brighton)

Trade Exhibition

Demonstrations and Poster viewing

### **Afternoon Session:**

*Theme:* Content-based image retrieval  
- emerging issues

*Plenary session:* Professor Mark  
Overmaars (University of Utrecht)

*Parallel sessions:* - **Research**

**Workshop:** submitted papers.

**Practitioner Workshop:** presentations  
including Chris Wilkie (BBC  
Resources), Ian Davis (Photonica),  
Matt Cooper (Manchester  
Visualisation Centre) and Margaret  
Graham (Institute for Image Data  
Research)

---

# Computers and society —

## Enthusiasm and Concern: Results of the Technology Poll

Langdon Winner  
(to appear in Tech Knowledge  
Review, Netfuture, Feb 29)

Everywhere one looks these days there's giddy excitement about technology, a sentiment so common that it often seems to verge on mass ecstasy. In the media as well as in conversations of everyday folks "technology" is praised as the fount of everything that is new and promising in the world, a cornucopia of fabulous jobs, higher incomes, better health, longer lives, and more satisfying ways of living. Improvements that people used to attribute to modern civilization or perhaps to science, are now widely believed to flow from "technology," especially the realm of digital electronics and computer networks.

But does the insistent buzz of news stories and personal anecdotes reflect what the great majority of people are actually thinking? Is the ardor for computers, cyberspace, and dot com enterprise displayed, for example, in tacky Super Bowl ads also common in the populace at large? A poll released this week strongly suggests the answer is "yes."

### Internet adoration poll

The survey was conducted last November and December by International Communications Research (ICR) of Media, Pa., sponsored by National Public Radio, The Kaiser Family Foundation and the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. Pollsters tapped a nationally representative sample of 1,506 adults 18 years older, asking a long list of

questions about technology, especially their views of the computer and Internet. The same survey also asked 625 children, 10-17 years for their views on the matter. Results from this research are extensive, well worth lengthy analysis and interpretation. My comments here offer some initial, highly personal impressions, looking mainly at opinions from the sample of adults.

The IRC study indicates that computer use is indeed widespread: 92% of adults have used a computer; 53% use a computer at work. Perhaps more surprisingly, 69% of those polled reported having a computer at home; of these 70% said they had just one computer, not more. For most people, having a computer at home is a fairly new experience; more than half sample said they'd gotten their first computer just within the past five years.

The Internet is now widely available to Americans: 75% of adults have used it at one time or another; 53% have access to the Internet or email at home while 27% use the Internet at work. For those who log on to the Internet on the job, 63% said it was "essential" for their work. The data suggests that people use the Internet at home primarily for information gathering and leisure activities - current events (43%), entertainment, sports and hobbies (44%), travel (38%), and health (31%). But the more practical, business-like uses are much less common: paying bills (11%); investments (10%); and shopping (28%). Can it be that people are dragging their feet when it comes to exploiting the economic functions of the networked computing in the home? For now, the data suggests as much.

### Computer popularity

Seeking a larger context to situate its findings, the poll asked people to list the one or two technological

developments of the twentieth century they found most significant. The computer received far and away the highest ranking with 65%. Next came the automobile with 33%. Far down the list were older technologies, ones heavily promoted in their heydays decades back, but now evidently fading in the public's esteem. Remember the saving power of nuclear energy and the "revolution" it promised in the 1950s? Only 11% of those polled now place it among the most significant technologies. Similarly, the halo that once surrounded space flight seems to have lost its shine; only 14% placed rocketry in the top rank. Even television scored rather low in the pantheon of technical systems, coming in at a mere 19%. Given the prominence of TV in people's lives, it is fascinating to see it pale in significance when compared to the computer. Opinions on other notable contenders include the airplane (15%); broadcast radio (12%) and genetic engineering (14%).

Several questions in the poll tried to discover how people feel about changes in their lives brought about by technological transformation. Adults were asked to respond to the assertion, "Science and technology make our way of life change too fast." Those who agreed "strongly" or "to some extent" totaled 56%. Asked how well they were adapting to computers, 56% said they were "keeping up", 43% "being left behind."

### Computers and lifestyle

Answers to the lifestyle questions produced what is probably the most important headline to emerge from the study, namely that the great majority of people of all ages and income levels now have very positive feelings about the computer. Those who have a computer at home were asked whether "a computer at home has made your life better or worse, or hasn't it made much

---

difference?" A large majority, 64%, said that the computer had made life better while 2% answered "worse" and 34% indicated not much difference. The children sampled were even more positive; 91% said they thought the computer made life better for Americans. By comparison, only 42% adults and 35% of youngsters thought that television made their lives better. In fact, computer use seems to be cutting into American's TV watching time; 28% of adults and 45% of children say they have watched less TV since the computer entered the home, although the exact amount of time was not measured.

### **Computers and isolation**

But findings about computers and the better life come with a stunning paradox. Of those who have computers at home 57% report that they now spend less time with families and friends as a consequence. This mirrors controversial results in other surveys of our emerging computer culture. A 1998 survey at Carnegie Mellon University found astonishing levels of loneliness among first time computer users. Another poll just released by political scientist Norman Nie of Stanford University also finds computer users spending less time with friends and attending fewer social events. Stories in the New York Times have dubbed this phenomenon the "Newer, Lonelier Crowd," recalling studies from sociologists of the 1950s that described the collapse of community life in American and the rise of an isolated individualism. Today's advocates of virtual community howl in disbelief whenever results of this kind are released; they prefer lovely anecdotes about all the people they've seen energetically connecting online.

But when substantial numbers of people in scientifically selected random sample tell you they are disconnecting from those closest to them, all those lovely stories about close community in cyberspace seem like wishful thinking. Let's face it:

Large numbers of Americans are finding satisfaction in computer games, email, chat rooms, and Web browsing and are perfectly happy doing these things in more or less solitary ways. Is this news really all that surprising? Unlike television viewing that at least provides families a semblance of social interaction as they watch shows together, computer use is typically a one person, one tube affair. Perhaps the computer finally offers ways to resolve a problem once identified by Jean-Paul Sartre: "Hell is other people."

### **Political awareness**

Another favorite theme among proponents of computerized social life -- that the Internet will be a tonic for democracy - also finds scant support in the poll. The computer and Internet, you'll recall, were supposed to revitalize politics by making it easier and more attractive for citizens to participate. I wait by my window each day looking for signs that this is actually happening. Alas, very little political activity is reflected in the IRC data. Only 12% of adult computer users had ever visited a political candidate's site on the Internet and only 2% had contributed money to a political candidate or charity online. By comparison, 31% of children with computers in the home said they had visited a pornography Web site (if only by accident).

Of course, the political findings do not begin to measure the kinds of high speed, online mobilization and lobbying one sees among computer equipped activists nowadays, a phenomenon that Bruce Bimber has termed "accelerated pluralism". But if one's talking about the public engagement of the populace as a whole (an isn't that what democracy is all about?) then the widely predicted reinvigoration of political life does not seem to have reached some 88% of us who are currently asleep at the mouse.

### **Digital divide**

Today's worries about the "digital

divide" are to some extent confirmed by the study, although the inequalities are not as drastic as the worst case scenarios have suggested. Among persons with low income (\$30,000 per year or less) 35% use a computer at work and 48% at home; among the less educated (high school or less) 38% at work, 57% at home. The gap between income levels is most prominent when it come to Internet use at home where 72% of families with incomes of \$50,000 or more are connected while only 31%, of low income families have Internet links. Among blacks and whites there was a relatively small gap in computer use at work, 28% vs. 36%, but much larger signs of inequality at home: 35% vs. 52% in computer use and 19% vs. 34% in the availability of Internet or email.

The specific ways people use the Internet is more greatly influenced by income and education than by race. Both high income blacks (27%) and whites (38%) reported doing some shopping on line. But this figure drops to 6% of low income blacks and 10% of whites. Thus far the poor have not caught the bug of E-Commerce. (Once again social science does a wonderful job of revealing the obvious: Those with lower incomes tend to shop less frequently.)

About half of those polled (46%) said they believe that differences in access to computing have widened gaps in income and opportunity in our society. Apparently more generous than their elected leaders or today's talk show hosts, 61% of the sample affirmed that government should help low-income people gain access to computers and the Internet.

How realistic are the popular views reflected in the poll? In my reading, people see to have a fairly well-balanced understanding of what computers can do as well as some drawbacks and dangers. Hence, while there was overwhelming enthusiasm for the Internet, more than half of adults polled said they trusted the information

---

found on the Net just a little or not at all. Given my own experience, that seems about right. The data also revealed folks to be profoundly wary of a host of troubles linked to computer use -- loss of privacy, smut on the Web, dangerous strangers online, and other ills. Interestingly enough, large majorities of those who recognized problems in the online world - pornography, information on building bombs, gun purchasing, hate speech, false advertising, etc. - believe that "government should do something about" these matters, a conclusion that candidates running for office this year might well notice. As reflected in the survey, the general public seems worried about the darker side of cyberspace, far more so than the digital cognoscente in Silicon Valley or our free-market-happy political leaders.

### **Computers and job security**

Whether people are realistic about computers, jobs and income is a fascinating question as well. An astonishing 87% of those polled say they were not concerned that computers might eliminate their jobs. In addition, some 40% believe that computers in the workplace will increase wages, while 39% think it will make no difference. While these views reflect the glowing economic optimism of the Clinton years, they seem at odds with some longer term historical trends. In recent decades the introduction of computers has eliminated whole categories of jobs formerly held by ordinary folks - telephone operators, bank clerks, and the like. Networked computer makes it extremely easy to get rid of the middle man, the person who stands between the information or product desired and its ultimate consumer. But these middle level jobs are exactly the ones most people still hold, the very ones targeted by "innovators" who hope to reap profits by "cutting costs." While the booming economy of the past decade may continue to create work categories jobs and keep unemployment rates down, the belief

that computers do not pose a threat to a great many jobs seems bizarre. Perhaps Americans have gotten used to having their lives shaken up by upheavals in "The New Economy." And perhaps they have come to accept wage levels that have remained essentially flat for several decades. A key message from the poll: Computers are fun and I'm still working. What me worry?

Another possible contradiction looming the survey results is the contrast between the overwhelmingly positive feelings expressed about computers and what appears to be a seriously deteriorating estimate people have of television. Only about 4 people in 10 said that television had made life better; even beepers (of all things) received a higher score, 50% on the "makes life better" scale. With a 64% positive rating, computers and the Internet seem well situated to pull society toward Nirvana. But perhaps the public is unaware that in the next several years the two boxes - computer and TV - are destined to merge into a single entity, one that will (if its corporate planners have anything to say about it) bring a torrent of advertising, entertainment and commercial messages into the home, crowding out many of the charming features of the Internet that folks now find so appealing - its flexibility, openness and way of putting ordinary folks in control. The survey gives no indication that folks realize that there's likely to be trouble ahead struggle ahead as today's romance with computer encounters pungent economic forces.

### **Computers and community**

The IRC research gives us much to ponder. It is certainly a relief to have some solid numbers to help test the various claims and counter claims advanced as Americans flock to the online world. At the same time, it is worth noting some serious limitations of polls like these, especially their unwillingness to move beyond conventional assumptions about society and politics. For example, the

poll did not ask people for their opinions about improvement or decline in the communities in which they reside. An excellent question would have been: "Is online commerce making your neighborhood, town, or city a better place worse place to live?" But nothing remotely like that question was asked of hundreds surveyed. The underlying worldview of the IRC and its sponsors projects a society of individuals who move back and forth between the workplace and family, but encounter nothing in between. Thus, the poll sheds no light on crucial issues about computers and the vitality of present and future communities, issues hotly debated in writings about cyberspace and society.

In a similar way, the survey did nothing to encourage people to share their opinions on emerging concentrations of economic and political power, developments obviously connected to the development of digital electronics and widely recognized as such. Perhaps the pollsters found opinions on these matters too volatile to explore, too difficult to measure. But the gaping absence of such topics lends an air of eerie unreality to otherwise valuable research. Most Americans are perfectly aware that the new millionaires, billionaires, and media conglomerates are bringing substantial and rapid change to our ways of living. All of us all know at least a little about Bill Gates, the antitrust suit, megamergers between AOL and Time Warner, and the like. Why not ask our opinions about wealth, power and conflict? The IRC poll evidently decided to err on the side of politeness, not bothering to inquire about public issues that only make people unhappy.

### **Computerless and proud**

One last gem popped out at me from the reams of data and analysis. Buried in the sample was a small but not insignificant minority of persons who don't have a computer and evidently don't plan to get one. Of all the people queried, this group seemed

---

# Conferences

---

*contd from page 5*

consistently most contented. Although almost unimaginable in the year 2000, these rugged souls claim they're actually able to do their jobs, communicate with friends, obtain information, and even go shopping, all without the power of digital equipment. Simply amazing! Asked if they feel "left out" of the world taking shape around them, three quarters answered "no." Obviously, they don't know what they're missing.

---

## **ACM CIKM '2000 Call for Papers**

**9th International Conference on  
Information and Knowledge  
Management**

**November 6-11, 2000, Washington,  
DC, USA**

**[http://www.csee.umbc.edu/cikm/  
2000](http://www.csee.umbc.edu/cikm/2000)**

CIKM'2000 will bring together leading researchers and developers in a wide variety of scientific areas, with a common interest in improving information and knowledge management technologies. We solicit papers in the following areas, but are not limited to:

Advanced Search and Query Facilities ; Intelligent Search ; Data Mining ; Knowledge and Resource Discovery ; Data Warehousing ; Data and Information Visualization; Middleware Data Services; Interactive Data Exploration ; Cooperating and Interoperable Federated Systems ; Digital Libraries ; Heterogeneous and Distributed Systems; E-Commerce and Other Advanced Applications ; Visual Query Languages and Tools; Scientific and Statistical Databases ; Data Transformation, Evolution, and Migration ; Meta-data management and Reflection ; Decision-Support Systems ; Optimization and Performance ; Replication, Caching, and View

Materialization; Internet and the WWW ; Web-based Information Systems ; Large-Scale Data Environments ; Data Management for Advanced Applications; Special Purpose Database Technologies ; Challenges of Next-Generation Applications

Paper Submission:

Authors are invited to submit complete and original papers. Manuscripts should include an abstract and be limited to 5000 words. Submissions should include the title, author(s), author's affiliation, e-mail address, telephone/ fax numbers and postal address. Indicate the correspondence author who is responsible for correspondence and preparing the camera ready paper for the proceedings. Submissions of manuscripts are due by May 8, 2000. For details on electronic paper submission check the conference web site at [www.csee.umbc.edu/cikm/2000](http://www.csee.umbc.edu/cikm/2000). In special circumstances it may also accept seven copies of the manuscript submitted directly to the appropriate

Important Dates:

Full papers, workshops, tutorials due:  
May 8, 2000

Notification of acceptance: August 8,  
2000

Camera ready papers due: September  
8, 2000

Workshops and Tutorials:

Send proposals to: E. K. Park,  
CIKM'2000 Workshop and Tutorial  
Chair, University of Missouri at Kansas  
City. Email: [ekpark@cstp.umkc.edu](mailto:ekpark@cstp.umkc.edu)

---

## **Information Doors -- Where Information Search and Hypertext Link**

**May 30th 2000**

**San Antonio, Texas, USA**

**[http://www.ics.mq.edu.au/~einat/  
info\\_doors/](http://www.ics.mq.edu.au/~einat/info_doors/)**

The purpose of this workshop is to tackle the problem of creating new hypertexts on-the-fly for representing other hypertext documents in the context of search results.

Online search results are, no doubt, a form of hypertext created on-the-fly. Search results pages are also probably the most frequently seen hypertext form of writing nowadays. However, the research community tends to identify the presentation search results with Information Retrieval research. This workshop will consider search results as a form of hypertext, encouraging discussion about the nature of this dynamically created textual point-of-departure.

The task of reading from a screen is not a trivial one, nor is the task of navigating between online texts. Even less trivial is creating a new text to represent other texts that are interconnected. In the case of hypertext representation of search results these tasks are combined to create a new on-screen text that describes and links other texts or entities. The purpose of this workshop is to tackle the problem of creating new hypertexts on-the-fly for representing other hypertext documents in the context of search results.

The workshop will focus on the textual aspects of the problem:-

How texts are read online?

How previously unseen documents might be presented in text to people who search for information?

How people navigate through textual search results?

What are the informative role and value of the newly created intermediate page?

Does it influence the reading of the documents followed by users?

---

Does it change the focus and the meaning of the texts as they are perceived by readers?

Are there any emerging textual or language conventions of presentation within hypertext systems and among hypertext authors that can be used in order to facilitate navigation through search results (e.g. naming of links conventions on the web, similarities in annotation patterns in annotation systems, use of titles and paragraph arrangements and positioning, use of lists and preferred methods of list ordering, and authors' frequent vocabulary choices).

The workshop aims to bring together participants from many disciplines such as Human-Computer-Interaction (HCI), Information Retrieval (IR), Natural Language Processing (NLP), Digital Library (DL), applied psychology and psycholinguistics, to discuss the nature of one of the most frequently seen hypertext presentation in recent years -- online search results. It will address the problem of textual presentation and hypertext representations of search results by looking at evaluations and studies of hypertext representations, studies about interaction with texts, how text representations should be designed in terms of language coherence and on-screen/online reading limitations, how to improve navigation with a smarter choice of textual representation, etc. The term 'textual representation' relates to how a document or a group-of-documents is represented in text (short or long texts, coherently summarised or organised by fixed fields like author, title, last updated, citations, generating descriptions, extracting passages, and so on). We will aim for gathering our knowledge to enhance and integrate our experience about hypertext in order to improve the options users are presented with while searching for information. The goal of the workshop is to create an interdisciplinary community that is able to address

issues concerning search results presentation in the context of an online hypertext system.

The workshop will specifically focus on the textual representation of results. It will not look at graphical representations of search results unless these shed new light on a textual issue, such as a comparison between textual and graphical representations of documents. The following list of suggested topics is only a short one and authors are encouraged to add more related issues and directions of investigations that are missing from it.

#### Topics

*Issues of presentation:* - Choosing what information to show about found entities (summaries, titles, links, annotations, additional related information, etc.); Grouping of results; Labelling Groups of documents; Creating hierarchies of results; Comparisons between textual & graphical representations of results

*Issues of results refinement:* - Similarities detected between results (represented in text); Query refinement (textual options)

*Issues of evaluation:* - How results are read; Does presentation change users navigation experience; Different users - different presentations?; Large scale studies; Task-specific studies

*Issues of speed and efficiency:* - Commercial applications

#### Important Dates

Submission of papers - 5 April 2000

Notification of acceptance - 30 April 2000

Workshop - 30 May 2000

#### Submission

Papers are due on the 5th of April 2000. All papers should be submitted electronically via email (sent to [einat@ics.mq.edu.au](mailto:einat@ics.mq.edu.au)). PDF submissions are preferred (if this is not possible then try to send it as a .txt, .ps or MSWord file). Papers should be no

longer than 6 pages.

#### Workshop Organiser:

Einat Amitay (Macquarie University & CSIRO). Email: [einat@ics.mq.edu.au](mailto:einat@ics.mq.edu.au)

---

---

### Further calls

4th Intl. Conf on Flexible Query Answering Systems (FQAS), Warsaw, Poland

**Deadline:** 15.4.2000

**Conference dates:** 25 - 27 October 2000

**URL:** <http://viking.ibspan.waw.pl/fqas2000/>

---

SPIRE'2000 - String Processing and Information REtrieval (SPIRE), A Coruna, Spain

**Deadline:** 20.4.2000

**Conference dates:** 27- 29 September 2000

**URL:** <http://rosalia.dc.fi.udc.es/spire2000/>

---

4th. European Conf. on Research and Advanced Technology for Digital Libraries (ECDL), Lisbon, Portugal

**Deadline:** 1.5.2000

**Conference dates:** 18 - 20 September 2000

**URL:** <http://www.bn.pt/org/agenda/ecdl2000/>

---

3rd Intl. Conf. on Practical Aspects of Knowledge Management (PAKM), Basel, Switzerland

**Deadline:** 30.6.2000

**Conference dates:** 30- 31 October 2000

**URL:** <http://research.swisslife.ch/pakm2000>

---

# Colloquium

---

## 22nd Annual Colloquium on IR Research

5th-7th April 2000,

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, England

<http://www.soi.city.ac.uk/~andym/colloq2000/index.html>

Draft Programme

### Wednesday 5 April 2000

From 8.30: Registration, coffee

10.00-10.15: Introduction

10.15-11.15: Keynote talk. Donna Harman: *What we have learned, and not learned, from TREC*

11.30-12.30

Franc Grootjen. *Employing semantical issues in syntactical navigation*

Avi Arampatzis, Th.P. van der Weide, C.H.A. Koster, P. van Bommel: *An Evaluation of Linguistically-motivated Indexing Schemes*

2.00-3.30

Helene Fowkes, Micheline Beaulieu: *Interactive Searching behaviour: Okapi experiment for TREC 8*

Daqing He, Ayse Goker: *Towards learning techniques for the Web: Establishing session boundaries from Web userlogs*

Murat Karamuftuoglu: *Understanding Information Retrieval: A Semiotic Framework*

4.00-5.00

Joe Carthy, Alan F. Smeaton: *The Design of a Topic Tracking System*

Joe Carthy, Paula Hatch, Nicola Stokes : *Topic Detection, A New Application for Lexical Chaining?*

### Thursday 6 April 2000

9.30-10.30

Holger Billhardt: *Using Term Co-occurrence Data for Document Indexing and Retrieval*

Gareth J. F. Jones: *Exploring the incorporation of Acoustic Information into Term Weights for Spoken Document Retrieval*

11.00-11.30

Informer/Springer competition award paper

Djoerd Hiemstra, Franciska de Jong: *Disambiguation strategies for cross-language information retrieval*

11.30-12.30

Claudia Rolker, Ralf Kramer: *Dynamic Selection of Information Retrieval Algorithms*

Keith Bradley, Rachael Rafter, Barry Smyth: *A Case-Based User Profiling Approach to Personalised Information Retrieval*

2.00-3.30

Olga Vechtomova, Stephen Robertson: *Integration of Collocation Statistics into the Probabilistic Retrieval Model*

Xiangji Huang, Stephen Robertson: *A Probabilistic Approach to Chinese Information Retrieval: Theory and Experiments*

Mark Girolami: *Document Representations Based on Generative Multivariate Bernoulli Latent Topic Models*

4.00-5.00

BCS IRSG AGM

7.00-9.00

Colloquium Dinner

### Friday 7 April 2000

9.30-10.30

Benjamin Piwowarski: *Learning in Information Retrieval: a Probabilistic Differential Approach*

Claus-Peter Klas, Norbert Fuhr: *A new Effective Approach for Categorizing Web Documents*

11.00-12.00

Stefan M. Rueger, Shalini Sewraz: *A Visual Information-Retrieval Navigator*

Steve Pollitt: *Navigating N-Dimensional Information Space with Data and Documents through View-Based Searching*

12.00-12.30

Wrap-up and conference close

---

## The INFORMER

The *Informer* is published quarterly by the British Computer Society Information Retrieval Specialist Group.

**Editorial Team:** Jon Ritchie/Ian Ruthven, Department of Computing Science, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ. Tel: 0141 330 6292 Fax: 0141 330 4913. Email: [informer@dcs.gla.ac.uk](mailto:informer@dcs.gla.ac.uk)

**Advertising:** Jan J IJdens, BCS IRSG Chair, Sharp Laboratories of Europe, Oxford Science Park, Oxford. OX4 4GB.

**Email:** [jan@sharp.co.uk](mailto:jan@sharp.co.uk) (or [chair.irsg@bcs.org.uk](mailto:chair.irsg@bcs.org.uk))

**Change of address/removal from mailing list:** Specialist groups liason at BCS HQ **Email:** [sg@bcs.org.uk](mailto:sg@bcs.org.uk)